arXiv:1611.10157v1 [math.PR] 30 Nov 2016

L^p solution of backward stochastic differential equations driven by a marked point process

Fulvia Confortola
Politecnico di Milano, Dipartimento di Matematica
piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32, 20133 Milano, Italy
e-mail: fulvia.confortola@polimi.it

Abstract

We obtain existence and uniqueness in L^p, $p > 1$ of the solutions of a backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs for short) driven by a marked point process, on a bounded interval. We show that the solution of the BSDE can be approximated by a finite system of deterministic differential equations. As application we address an optimal control problems for point processes of general non-Markovian type and show that BSDEs can be used to prove existence of an optimal control and to represent the value function.

AMS 2010 subject classifications: 60H10, 60G55, 93E20.

Keywords: Backward stochastic differential equations, marked point processes, stochastic optimal control.

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider a backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE for short in the remaining) driven by a random measure, without diffusion part, on a finite time interval, of the following form:

$$Y_t + \int_t^T \int_K Z(s,x)\,\mu(ds,dx) = \xi + \int_t^T \int_K f(s,x,Y_{s-},Z_s(\cdot))\,\nu(ds,dx). \tag{1.1}$$

μ is the counting measure corresponding to a non-explosive marked point process $(S_n, X_n)_{n\geq 1}$, where (S_n) is an increasing sequence of random times and (X_n) a sequence of random variables in the state (or mark) space K. ν is the predictable compensator of the measure μ. The generator f and the final condition ξ are given. The unknown process is a pair $(Y_t, Z_t(\cdot))$, where Y is a real adapted càdlàg process and $\{Z_t(x),\, t \in [0,T],\, x \in K\}$ is a predictable random field.

The BSDEs have been introduced by Pardoux and Peng [20]. In this first paper, and in most of the subsequent ones, the driving term is a Brownian motion. Since then, there has been an increasing interest for this subject: these equations have a wide range of applications in to various fields of stochastic analysis, including probabilistic techniques in partial differential equations, stochastic optimal control, mathematical finance (see e.g. El Karoui, Peng and Quenez [16]). Recently, BSDEs driven by a Brownian motion and a random measure have also been considered due their utility in the study of stochastic maximum principle, partial differential equations of nonlocal type, quasi-variational inequalities, impulse control and stochastic problem in stochastic finance, see e.g. Buckdahn and Pardoux [5], Tang and Li [22], Barles, Buckdahn and Pardoux

[3], Xia [23], Becherer [4], Crépey and Matoussi [13], or Carbone, Ferrario and Santacroce [6] among many others.

In spite of the large literature devoted to BSDEs with driving term continuous or continuous-plus-jumps there are relatively few results on the case of a driving term which is purely discontinuous. We cite Shen and Elliott [21] for the particularly simple "one-jump" case, or Cohen and Elliott [7]-[8] and Cohen and Szpruch [9] for BSDEs associated to Markov chains.

In [11] and [2] are considered BSDEs driven by more general random measures, related to a Markov and semi-Markov process respectively, in connection with optimal control problem. The more general non-Markovian case is studied in [10]. Here the authors, relying upon the martingale representation theorem, prove existence, uniqueness and continuous dependence on the data of the solution of equation (1.1) in suitable weighted L^2 spaces. They require a L^2 summability condition on the data ξ and f and a Lipschitz condition on the generator f.

The first aim of this paper is to extend the results contained in [10] and to develop a L^p-theory for $p > 1$ for this class of BSEDs. The basic hypothesis on the generator f is an uniform Lipschitz condition (see Hypothesis 3.1 for precise statements). In order to solve the equation, beside measurability assumptions, we require, for $p > 1$ the L^p summability condition

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\beta A_T}|\xi|^p\right] + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_K e^{\beta A_t}|f(\omega, t, 0, 0)|^p \nu(dt, dx) < \infty,$$

to hold for a suitable β. To prove existence and uniqueness for the BSDE we require -as in [10]- only that the jump times S_n are totally inaccessible (see **Assumption $\mathbf{A_1}$** below).

The results are stated in the case of a scalar equation, but the extension to the vector-valued case is immediate. They are presented in Section 3, after an introductory section devoted to notation and preliminaries.

We recall that the L^1 theory for the solutions of the equation (1.1) is developed in [12]. Our L^p assumptions are not in general comparable with the L^1 assumptions which involve suitable doubly weighted spaces. Moreover we require only that the point process is *quasi-left continuous* (**Assumption $\mathbf{A_1}$**) and, using the martingale representation theorem and fixed point arguments, we do not need the technical **Assumption $\mathbf{A_2}$** (see Subsection 4.2).

The second purpose of the paper is presented in Section 4, where we illustrate an approximation scheme to solve the equation (1.1).
We show that the solution to (1.1) can be obtained as limit of a sequence of approximating BSDEs driven by a random measure with a finite number of jumps. We use the *a priori* estimates to obtain an error estimate for this approximation (see Proposition 4.1). It involves the distribution of the last jump time and in particular cases it can be easily computed.

If we add now **Assumption $\mathbf{A_2}$**, we can replace the approximating BSDE with a system of finite deterministic ordinary differential equation, using the result in [12]. The method to reduce the BSDE to a sequence of ODEs has been used also for a BSDE driven by a Brownian motion plus a Poisson process, see e.g. Kharroubi and Lim [17]. In recent years there has been much interest in numerical approximation of the solution to the BSDEs, in the context of diffusion processes. Our results might be used for similar methods in the framework of pure jump processes as well.

In Section 5 we address an optimal control problem for a marked process, formulated in a classical way, with the BSDEs approach. We extend the results on optimal control problem in [10], assuming, for $p > 1$, L^p summability conditions on the data of the problem.

2 The setting

Let $T \in (0,\infty)$ be a fixed time horizon. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and $(K, \mathcal{K})$ a Lusin space. Assume we have a non-explosive multivariate point process (also called marked point process) on $[0,T] \times K$: this is a sequence $(S_n, X_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of random variables with distinct times of occurrence S_n and with marks X_n. S_n taking values in $(0,T] \cup \{\infty\}$ and X_n in K. We set $S_0 = 0$ and we assume, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., $S_1 > 0$; if $S_n \leq T$ then $S_n < S_{n+1}$ and $S_n \leq S_{n+1}$ everywhere; $\Omega = \cup\{S_n > T\}$. Note that the "mark" X_n is relevant on the set $\{S_n \leq T\}$ only, but it is convenient to have it defined on the whole set Ω, and without restriction we may assume that $X_n = \Delta$ when $S_n = \infty$, where Δ is a distinguished point in K.

The multivariate point process can be viewed as a random measure of the form

$$\mu(dt, dx) = \sum_{n\geq 1:\, S_n \leq T} \varepsilon_{(S_n, X_n)}(dt, dx). \tag{2.1}$$

where $\varepsilon_{(t,x)}$ denotes the Dirac measure.

We denote by $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ the filtration generated by the point process, which is the smallest filtration for which each S_n is a stopping time and X_n is $\mathcal{F}_{S_n}$-measurable. As we will see, the special structure of this filtration plays a fundamental role in all what follows. We let $\mathcal{P}$ be the predictable σ-field on $\Omega \times [0,T]$, and for any auxiliary measurable space $(G, \mathcal{G})$ a function on the product $\Omega \times [0,T] \times G$ which is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{G}$ is called *predictable*.

We denote by ν the predictable compensator of the measure μ, relative to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)$. The measure ν admits the disintegration:

$$\nu(\omega, dt, dx) \;=\; dA_t(\omega)\, \phi_{\omega,t}(dx), \tag{2.2}$$

where A is an increasing càdlàg predictable process starting at $A_0 = 0$, which is also the predictable compensator of the univariate point process

$$N_t \;=\; \mu([0,t] \times E) \;=\; \sum_{n\geq 1} 1_{\{S_n \leq t\}}; \tag{2.3}$$

ϕ is a transition probability from $(\Omega \times [0,T], \mathcal{P})$ into $(K, \mathcal{K})$ and verifies the following equality

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \int_K H(t,x)\; \mu(dt\,, dx) = \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \int_K H(t,x)\; \phi_t(dx)\, dA_t \tag{2.4}$$

for every nonnegative $H_t(\omega, y)$, $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{K}$-measurable.

The following assumption will hold throughout:

Assumption $\mathbf{A_1}$: The process A is continuous (equivalently: the jump times S_n are totally inaccessible).

This condition amounts to the quasi-left continuity of N.

3 The backward equation

We denote by $\mathcal{B}(K)$ the set of all Borel functions on K; if Z is a measurable function on $\Omega \times [0,T] \times K$, we write $Z_{\omega,t}(x) = Z(\omega, t, x)$, so each $Z_{\omega,t}$, often abbreviated as Z_t or $Z_t(\cdot)$, is an element of $\mathcal{B}(K)$.

In the following we will consider the backward stochastic differential equation

$$Y_t + \int_t^T \int_K Z(s,x)\, \mu(ds, dx) = \xi + \int_t^T \int_K f(s, x, Y_{s-}, Z_s(\cdot))\, \nu(ds, dx), \tag{3.1}$$

where the generator f and the final condition ξ are given.

Definition 3.1 *A* solution *is a pair (Y, Z) consisting in an adapted càdlàg process Y and a predictable function Z on $\Omega \times [0,T] \times E$ satisfying $\int_0^T \int_E |Z(t,x)|\, \nu(ds,dx) < \infty$ a.s., such that* (3.1) *holds for all $t \in [0,T]$, outside a $\mathbb{P}$-null set.*

An other notion of *solution* can be introduced by observing that (3.1) ca be rewritten as follows:

$$Y_t + \sum_{n\geq 1} Z(S_n, X_n)\, 1_{\{t<S_n\leq T\}} = \xi + \int_{(t,T]} \int_E f(s,x,Y_{s-}, Z_s(\cdot))\, \nu(ds,dx). \tag{3.2}$$

Since A is continuous, (3.2) yields, outside a $\mathbb{P}$-null set:

$$\Delta Y_{S_n} = Z(S_n, X_n) \ \text{ if } S_n \leq T \text{ and } n \geq 1, \qquad Y \text{ is continuous outside } \{S_1, \cdots, S_n, \cdots\}. \tag{3.3}$$

In other words, Y completely determines the predictable function Z outside a null set with respect to the measure $\mathbb{P}(d\omega)\mu(\omega, dt, dx)$, hence also outside a $\mathbb{P}(d\omega)\nu(\omega, dt, dx)$-null set. Equivalently, if (Y, Z) is a solution and Z' is another predictable function, then (Y, Z') being another solution is the same as having $Z' = Z$ outside a $\mathbb{P}(d\omega)\mu(\omega, dt, dx)$-null set, and the same as having $Z' = Z$ outside a $\mathbb{P}(d\omega)\nu(\omega, dt, dx)$-null set.

Hence it is possible to define a *solution* to (3.1) an adapted càdlàg process Y for which there exists a predictable function Z satisfying

$$\int_0^T \int_E |Z(s,x)|\, \nu(ds,dx) < \infty \text{ a.s.},$$

such that the pair (Y, Z) satisfies (3.1) for all $t \in [0,T]$, outside a $\mathbb{P}$-null set. Then, *uniqueness* of the solution means that, for any two solutions Y and Y' we have $Y_t = Y'_t$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, outside a $\mathbb{P}$-null set.

3.1 The L^p theory.

We introduce the Banach space L^p_β, depending on a parameter $\beta > 0$, of equivalence classes of pairs of processes (Y, Z) on $[0,T]$ such that Y is progressive, Z is predictable and the norm

$$\|(Y,Z)\| = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \int_K (|Y_s|^p + |Z(t,x)|^p)\, e^{\beta A_s}\, \nu(dt,dx)\right]$$

is finite. Elements of L^p_β are identified up to almost sure equality with respect to the measure $\mathbb{P}(d\omega)\, d\nu(dt,dx)$, i.e. when the norm of their difference is zero. We sometimes identify processes (Y, Z) with their equivalence classes in the usual way.

Let us consider the following assumptions on the data ξ and f:

Hypothesis 3.1 *1. The final condition $\xi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable and $\mathbb{E}\, e^{\beta A_T} |\xi|^p < \infty$.*

2. f is a real-valued function on $\Omega \times [0,T] \times K \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{B}(K)$, such that

(i) for any predictable function Z on $\Omega \times [0,T] \times K$ the mapping

$$(\omega, t, x, y) \mapsto f(\omega, t, x, y, Z_{\omega,t}(\cdot)) \tag{3.4}$$

is predictable;

(ii) there exist $L \geq 0$, $L' \geq 0$ *such that for every* $\omega \in \Omega$, $t \in [0,T]$, $x \in K$, $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}$, $\zeta', \zeta \in \mathcal{B}(K)$ *we have*

$$\begin{array}{l} |f(\omega,t,x,y',\zeta) - f(\omega,t,x,y,\zeta)| \leq L'|y'-y| \\ \int_K |f(\omega,t,x,y,\zeta) - f(\omega,t,x,y,\zeta')|\phi_{\omega,t}(dx) \quad \leq \quad L\left(\int_K |\zeta'(v)-\zeta(v)|^p \, \phi_{\omega,t}(dv)\right)^{1/p} \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad = \quad L|\zeta - \zeta'|_{L^p(\phi)} \end{array} \tag{3.5}$$

where $\phi_{\omega,t}$ *are the measures occurring in* (2.2)*;*

(iii) We have

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_K e^{\beta A_t} |f(t,x,0,0)|^p \, \nu(dt,dx) < \infty \quad a.s. \tag{3.6}$$

The measurability condition imposed on the generator is slightly involved, but it is verified when we deal with a BSDE in order to solve an optimal control problem driven by a multivariate point processes. In this framework the suitable formulation is the following one

$$Y_t + \int_t^T \int_K Z(s,x)\, \mu(ds,dx) = \xi + \int_t^T \bar{f}(.,s,Y_{s-},\eta_s Z_s)\, dA_s, \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{l} \eta_{\omega,t} \text{ is a real-valued map on } \mathcal{B}(K), \text{ with } \ |\eta_{\omega,t}\zeta - \eta_{\omega,t}\zeta'| \leq \int_K |\zeta'(v)-\zeta(v)|\, \phi_{\omega,t}(dv), \\ Z \text{ predictable on } \Omega \times [0,T] \times K \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{the process } (\omega,t) \mapsto \eta_{\omega,t} Z_{\omega,t} \text{ is predictable,} \end{array} \tag{3.8}$$

$\bar{f}$ is a predictable function on $\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfying:

$$\begin{array}{c} |\bar{f}(t,y',z') - \bar{f}(t,y,z)| \leq L'|y'-y| + L|z'-z| \\ \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_K |\bar{f}(t,x,0,0)|^p e^{\beta A_t}\, \nu(dt,dx) < \infty \end{array} \tag{3.9}$$

The equation (3.7) reduces to (3.1) upon taking

$$f(\omega,s,x,y,\zeta) = \bar{f}(\omega,s,y,\eta_{\omega,s}\zeta), \tag{3.10}$$

and (3.9) for $\bar{f}$ plus (3.8) for $\eta_{\omega,t}$ yield, with the Hölder inequality, the (3.5) for f.

3.1.1 A priori estimate

In this section, we provide some *a priori* estimates for the solutions of Equation (3.1).

We start with a Lemma of Ito type.

Lemma 3.2 *Let* $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. *If* $(Y,Z) \in L^p_\beta$ *is a solution of* (3.1) *we have almost surely*

$$\begin{array}{c} |Y_t|^p e^{\beta A_t} + \int_t^T \int_K \left(|Y_{s-} + Z(s,y)|^p - |Y_{s-}|^p\right) e^{\beta A_s}\, \mu(ds,dy) + \beta \int_t^T |Y_s|^p e^{\beta A_s}\, dA_s \\ = |\xi|^p\, e^{\beta A_T} + \int_t^T \int_K p|Y_{s-}|^{p-1}\text{sign}(Y_s-)\, f(s,y,Y_s,Z_s(\cdot))\, e^{\beta A_s}\, \nu(ds,dy). \end{array} \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. Letting U_t and V_t be the left and right sides of and since these processes are càdlàg, and continuous outside the S_n's, and $U_T = V_T$, it suffices to check that outside a null set we have $\Delta U_{S_n} = \Delta V_{S_n}$ and also $U_t - U_s = V_t - V_s$ if $S_n \leq t < s < S_{n+1} \wedge T$, for all $n \geq 0$. The first property is obvious because $\Delta Y_{S_n} = Z(S_n, X_n)$ a.s. and A is continuous. The second property follows from $Y_t - Y_s = \int_t^s \int_K f(v,y,Y_v,Z_v(\cdot))\, \nu(dv,dy)$, implying $|Y_t|^p - |Y_s|^p = \int_t^s \int_K p|Y_r|^{p-1}\text{sign}(Y_s-)\, f(r,y,Y_r,Z_r(\cdot))\, \nu(dr,dx)$ plus a standard change of variables formula. □

Next we prove the following useful a priori estimates:

Lemma 3.3 *For every $\epsilon > 0$ let $C_\epsilon = \left(1 - \left(\frac{1}{1+\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\right)^{1-p}$.*

Suppose that Hypothesis 3.1 holds with $\beta > 1 + \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} + pL' + (p-1)(L^p(1+\epsilon))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$. Then there exist two constants C_1 and C_2 only depending on $(\beta, p, L, L', \epsilon)$, such that any pair (Y, Z) in L^p_β which solves (3.1) *satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_t|^p e^{\beta A_t} \le C_1 \mathbb{E}\Big(|\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} + \int_t^T \int_K |f(s,x,0,0)|^p \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dy)\Big) \tag{3.12}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_K (|Y_s|^p + |Z(s,x)|^p)\, e^{\beta A_s}\, \nu(ds,dx) \le C_2\, \mathbb{E}\Big(|\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} + \int_0^T \int_K |f(s,x,0,0)|^p \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dy)\Big). \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. We have $|Y_{s-} + Z(s,x)|^p - |Y_{s-}|^p \ge \frac{1}{1+\epsilon}|Z(s,x)|^p - (1 + \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon})|Y_{s-}|^p$, hence (3.11), and the fact that $\phi_{t,\omega}(K) = 1$ yield almost surely,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} |Y_t|^p e^{\beta A_t} & + & \frac{1}{1+\epsilon}\int_t^T \int_K |Z(s,x)|^p \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \mu(ds,dx) + \beta \int_t^T |Y_s|^p e^{\beta A_s} \, dA_s \\ & \le & |\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} + (1 + \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}) \int_t^T |Y_{s-}|^p \, e^{\beta A_s} \, dN_s \\ & + & p \int_t^T \int_K |Y_s|^{p-1} \, |f(s,x,Y_s,Z_s(\cdot)| \, e^{\beta A_s} \nu(ds,dx). \end{array} \tag{3.14}$$

Taking the expectation in (3.14) yields

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbb{E}|Y_t|^p \, e^{\beta A_t} + \mathbb{E}\int_t^T \int_K \Big(\frac{1}{1+\epsilon}|Z(s,x)|^p + \Big(\beta - 1 - \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\Big)|Y_s|^p\Big) \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dx) \\ \le \mathbb{E}\Big(|\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} + \int_t^T \int_K p|Y_s|^{p-1} \, |f(s,x,Y_s,Z_s(\cdot)| \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dx)\Big) \end{array} \tag{3.15}$$

From the Lipschitz condition of f and elementary inequalities it follows that

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbb{E}|Y_t|^p \, e^{\beta A_t} + \mathbb{E}\int_t^T \int_K \Big(\frac{1}{1+\epsilon}|Z(s,x)|^p + \Big(\beta - 1 - \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\Big)|Y_s|^p\Big) \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dx) \\ \le \mathbb{E}\Big(|\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} + \int_t^T \int_K p|Y_s|^{p-1} \, [|f(s,x,0,0)| + L'|Y_s|] \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dx)\Big) \\ + \mathbb{E}\Big(\int_t^T p|Y_s|^{p-1} \, L|Z_s|_{L^p(\phi)} e^{\beta A_s} \, dA_s \\ \le \mathbb{E}|\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} + \mathbb{E}\int_t^T \int_K \Big(\frac{p-1}{\gamma}\Big)^{p-1} |f(s,x,0,0)|^p \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dx) \\ + \mathbb{E}\int_t^T \int_K \Big[\Big(pL' + (p-1)(L^p(\frac{1+\epsilon}{\alpha}))^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \gamma\Big)|Y_s|^p + \frac{\alpha}{1+\epsilon}|Z_s|^p\Big] \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dx), \end{array}$$

with $\alpha, \gamma > 0$. If we choose $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}[\beta - 1 - \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} - pL' - (p-1)(L^p(\frac{1+\epsilon}{\alpha}))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}]$, when $(Y,Z) \in L^p_\beta$, this implies almost surely,

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbb{E}|Y_t|^p \, e^{\beta A_t} + \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\epsilon}\mathbb{E}\int_t^T \int_K |Z(s,x)|^p \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dx) \\ \quad + \mathbb{E}\int_t^T \int_K \frac{1}{2}\Big(\beta - 1 - \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} - pL' - (p-1)(2L^p(1+\epsilon))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\Big)|Y_s|^p \, \nu(ds,dx) \\ \le \mathbb{E}\Big(|\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} + \Big(\frac{p-1}{\gamma}\Big)^{p-1} \int_t^T \int_K |f(s,x,0,0)|^p \, e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds,dx)\Big), \end{array}$$

giving us both (3.12) and (3.13). □

3.1.2 Existence and uniqueness

In this section we will give an existence and uniqueness result for the equation (3.1). Our intent is to use the following integral representation theorem of marked point process martingales (see e.g. [14],[15]).

Theorem 3.4 *[11, Theorem 2.2] Given $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times K$, let M be an $\mathcal{F}_t$-martingale on $[t,T]$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$. Then there exists a predictable process H on $\Omega \times [0,T] \times K$ with $\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_K |H_s(x)|\, \nu(ds,dx) < \infty$ such that*

$$M_t = M_0 + \int_0^t \int_K H_s(x)\,(\mu(ds,dx) - \nu(ds,dx)), \qquad t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.16}$$

Theorem 3.5 *Suppose that ξ and the generator f satisfy Hypothesis 3.1 and $\beta > 1 + \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} + pL' + (p-1)((L+1)^p(1+\epsilon))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$. Then there exists a unique pair (Y,Z) in L^p_β which solves the BSDE (3.1).*

Proof. We start rewriting equation (3.1) in the following equivalent way

$$Y_t + \int_t^T \int_K Z(s,x)\,(\mu(ds,dx) - \nu(ds,dx)) = \xi + \int_t^T \int_K f(s,x,Y_{s-},Z(s,x)) - Z(s,x)\,\nu(ds,dx) \tag{3.17}$$

This formulation singles out the "martingale increment" $\int_t^T \int_K Z(s,x)\,(\mu(ds,dx)-\nu(ds,dx))$ and allows us to use Theorem 3.4. We define a mapping Φ from L^p_β into itself such that $(Y,Z) \in L^p_\beta$ is a solution of the BSDE (3.17) if and only if it is a fixed point of Φ.
More precisely, given $(U,V) \in L^p_\beta$, we set $(Y,Z) = \Phi(U,V)$ if (Y,Z) is the pair satisfying:

$$Y_t + \int_t^T \int_K Z(s,y)\,(\mu(ds,dx)-\nu(ds,dx)) = \xi + \int_t^T \int_K [f(s,x,U_s,V_s(\cdot)) - V_s(\cdot)]\,\nu(ds,dx). \tag{3.18}$$

We note that by the Lipschitz condition of f we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\int_t^T \int_K |f(s,x,U_s,V_s)|\,\nu(ds,dx) = \int_t^T \int_K e^{-\frac{\beta}{p}A_s} e^{\frac{\beta}{p}A_s} |f(s,x,U_s,V_s)|\,\nu(ds,dx)\\
&\le \textstyle\int_t^T e^{-\frac{\beta}{p}A_s} e^{\frac{\beta}{p}A_s} \Big[L'|U_s| + L\big(\int_K |V_s|^p\,\phi_s(x)\big)^{1/p} + \int_K |f(s,x,0,0)|\phi_s(dx)\Big]\, dA_s\\
&\le \Big(\textstyle\int_t^T e^{-\frac{\beta}{p-1}A_s} dA_s\Big)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \cdot \Big[L'\Big(\int_t^T e^{\beta A_s}|U_s|^p dA_s\Big)^{1/p}\\
&\quad + L\Big(\textstyle\int_t^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s}|V_s(x)|^p\,\nu(ds,dx)\Big)^{1/p} + \Big(\int_t^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s}|f(s,x,0,0)|^p\,\nu(ds,dx)\Big)^{1/p}\Big].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Since $\frac{\beta}{p-1}\int_t^T e^{-\frac{\beta}{p-1}A_s} dA_s = e^{-\frac{\beta}{p-1}A_t} - e^{-\frac{\beta}{p-1}A_T} \le e^{-\frac{\beta}{p-1}A_t}$ we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\textstyle\int_t^T \int_K |f(s,x,U_s,V_s)|\,\nu(ds,dx)\Big)^p\\
&\le C_p\big(\tfrac{p-1}{\beta}\big)^{p-1} e^{-\beta A_t} \textstyle\int_t^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s}((L')^p|U_s|^p + L^p|V(s,x)|^p + |f(s,x,0,0)|^p)\,\nu(ds,dx)\\
&\le C_{(p,\beta,L',L)} \textstyle\int_t^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s}(|U_s|^p + |V(s,x)|^p + |f(s,x,0,0)|^p)\,\nu(ds,dx).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Since (U,V) are in L^p_β and the (3.6) hold, the last inequality implies in particular that the random variable $\int_0^T \int_K |f(s,x,U_s,V_s)|\,\nu(ds,dx)$ is p integrable.

The solution (Y,Z) is defined by considering a càdlàg version of the martingale $M_t = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t}\left[\xi + \int_0^T \int_K [f(s,x,U_s,V_s) - V_s]\,\nu(ds,dx)\right]$. By the martingale representation Theorem 3.4, there exists a predictable process Z with $\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_K |Z_s(x)|\,\nu(ds,dx) < \infty$ such that

$$M_t = M_0 + \int_0^t \int_K Z(s,x)\,(\mu(dx\,ds) - \nu(ds,dx)), \qquad t \in [0,T].$$

Define the process Y by

$$Y_t = M_t - \int_0^t \int_K [f(s,x,U_s,V_s) - V_s]\,\nu(ds,dx), \qquad t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.21}$$

Noting that $Y_T = \xi$, we easily deduce that the equation (3.18) is satisfied.

It remains to show that $(Y,Z) \in L^p_\beta$. It follows by (3.21) that

$$Y_t = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t}\left[\xi + \int_t^T \int_K [f(s,x,U_s,V_s) - V_s]\,\nu(ds,dx)\right]$$

and so, using (3.20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\beta A_t}|Y_t|^p &\le 2^{p-1}e^{\beta A_t}|\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t}\xi|^p + 2^{p-1}e^{\beta A_t}\left|\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t}\int_t^T\int_K [f(s,x,U_s,V_s) - V_s]\,\nu(ds,dx)\right|^p \\ &\le 2^{p-1}\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t}\left[e^{\beta A_T}|\xi|^p + C_{(p,\beta,L',L,T)}\int_0^T\int_K e^{\beta A_s}(|U_s|^p + |V(s,x)|^p + |f(s,x,0,0)|^p)\,\nu(ds,dx).\right] \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Denoting by m_t the right-hand side of (3.22), we see that m is a martingale. In particular, for every stopping time S with values in $[0,T]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\,e^{\beta A_S}|Y_S|^p \le \mathbb{E}\,m_S = \mathbb{E}\,m_T < \infty \tag{3.23}$$

by the optional stopping theorem. Next we define the increasing sequence of stopping times

$$S_n = \inf\{t \in [0,T] \,:\, \int_0^t \int_K e^{\beta A_s}(|Y_s|^p + |Z(s,x)|^p)\,\nu(ds,dx) > n\},$$

with the convention $\inf\emptyset = T$. The Itô formula (3.11) can be applied to Y, Z on the interval $[0,S_n]$. Hence, proceeding as in Lemma 3.3, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\int_t^T\int_K \left[\tfrac{1}{2}\left(\beta - 1 - \tfrac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\right)|Y_s|^p + \tfrac{1}{1+\epsilon}|Z(s,x)|^p\right] e^{\beta A_s}\,\nu(ds,dx) \\ &\qquad \le \mathbb{E}\Big(|Y_{S_n}|^p e^{\beta A_{S_n}} + c(\epsilon,\beta,p)\int_t^T\int_K |f(s,x,U_s,V_s) - V_s|^p\,e^{\beta A_s}\,\nu(ds,dx)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

From (3.23) (with $S = S_n$) which we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\int_0^{S_n}\int_K e^{\beta A_s}(|Y_s|^p + |Z_s(y)|^p)\nu(dx,ds) \\ &\le c_1(\beta,\epsilon,p)\mathbb{E}e^{\beta A_T}|\xi|^p + c_2(\beta,\epsilon,p,L',L,T)\int_0^T\int_K e^{\beta A_s}(|U_s|^p + |V(s,x)|^p + |f(s,x,0,0)|^p)\,\nu(ds,dx). \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Setting $S = \lim_n S_n$ we deduce

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^S\int_K e^{\beta A_s}(|Y_s|^p + |Z_s(y)|^p)\nu(dx,ds) < \infty, \qquad \mathbb{P}-a.s.$$

which implies $S = T$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., by the definition of S_n. Letting $n \to \infty$ in (3.24) we conclude that $(Y, Z) \in \mathbb{L}^p_\beta$.

Finally we prove that the map Φ is a contraction. Let (U^i, V^i), $i = 1, 2$, be elements of L^p_β and let $(Y^i, Z^i) = \Phi(U^i, V^i)$. Denote $\overline{Y} = Y^1 - Y^2$, $\overline{Z} = Z^1 - Z^2$, $\overline{U} = U^1 - U^2$, $\overline{V} = V^1 - V^2$, $\overline{f}_s = f(s, x, U^1_s, V^1_s) - f(s, x, U^2_s, V^2_s) - \overline{V}$. Lemma 3.3 applies to $\overline{Y}, \overline{Z}$. Noting that $\overline{Y}_T = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} e^{\beta A_t} |\overline{Y}_t|^p + \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \int_K \left(\frac{1}{1+\epsilon} |\overline{Z}(s,x)|^p + \left(\beta - 1 - \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \right) |\overline{Y}_s|^p \right) e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds, dx) \\
&\quad \le p \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s} |\overline{Y}_s|^{p-1} \left[|\overline{f}_s| + |\overline{V}(s,x)| \right] \, \nu(ds, dx), \qquad t \in [0, T].
\end{aligned}$$

From the Lipschitz conditions of f and elementary inequalities it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_K \left[\left(\beta - 1 - \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \right) |\overline{Y}_s|^p + \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} |\overline{Z}(s,x)|^p \right] e^{\beta A_s} \nu(ds, dx) \\
&\quad \le p(L+1) \mathbb{E} \textstyle\int_t^T e^{\beta A_s} |\overline{Y}_s|^{p-1} \left(\int_K |\overline{V}(s,x)|^p \phi_s(dx) \right)^{1/p} dA_s + pL' \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s} |\overline{Y}_s|^{p-1} |\overline{U}_s| \, \nu(ds, dx) \\
&\le \tfrac{\alpha}{1+\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \textstyle\int_0^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s} |\overline{V}(s,x)|^p \, \nu(ds, dx) + (p-1) \left((L+1)^p \cdot \frac{1+\epsilon}{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s} |\overline{Y}_s|^p \, \nu(ds, dx) \\
&\quad + (p-1) \gamma L' \mathbb{E} \textstyle\int_0^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s} |\overline{Y}_s|^p \, \nu(ds, dx) + L' \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \right)^{p-1} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_K e^{\beta A_s} |\overline{U}_s|^p \, \nu(ds, dx)
\end{aligned}$$

for every $\alpha > 0$, $\gamma > 0$. This can be written

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \textstyle\int_0^T \int_K \left[\left(\beta - 1 - \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} - (p-1) \left(\frac{(L+1)^p (1+\epsilon)}{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} - (p-1) \gamma L' \right) |\overline{Y}_s|^p \right] \nu(ds, dx) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \textstyle\int_0^T \int_K \left[\frac{1}{1+\epsilon} |\overline{Z}(s,x)|^p \right] e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds, dx) \\
&\quad \le \mathbb{E} \textstyle\int_0^T \int_K \left[L' \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \right)^{p-1} |\overline{U}_s|^p + \frac{\alpha}{1+\epsilon} |\overline{V}(s,x)|^p \right] e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds, dx).
\end{aligned}$$

By the assumption on β it is possible to find $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\beta > 1 + \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} + (p-1) \left(\frac{(L+1)^p (1+\epsilon)}{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \frac{pL'}{\sqrt[p]{\alpha}}.$$

If $L' = 0$ we see that Φ is an α-contraction on L^p_β endowed with the equivalent norm

$$\begin{aligned}
(Y, Z) \mapsto \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_K &\left[\beta - 1 - \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} - (p-1) \left(\frac{(L+1)^p (1+\epsilon)}{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \right] |\overline{Y}_s|^p \nu(ds, dx) \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_K \left[\frac{1}{1+\epsilon} |\overline{Z}(s,x)|^p \right] e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds, dx). \quad (3.25)
\end{aligned}$$

If $L' > 0$ we choose $\gamma = 1/\sqrt[p]{\alpha}$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \textstyle\int_0^T \int_K \left[\frac{L'}{\sqrt[p]{\alpha}} |\overline{Y}_s|^p, \nu(ds, dx) + \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} |\overline{Z}(s,x)|^p \right] e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds, dx) \\
&\quad \le \mathbb{E} \textstyle\int_0^T \int_K \left[L' (\sqrt[p]{\alpha})^{p-1} |\overline{U}_s|^p + \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} \alpha |\overline{V}(s,x)|^p \right] e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds, dx) \\
&\quad = \alpha \, \mathbb{E} \textstyle\int_0^T \int_K \left[\frac{L'}{\sqrt[p]{\alpha}} |\overline{U}_s|^p + \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} |\overline{V}(s,x)|^p \right] e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds, dx),
\end{aligned}$$

so that Φ is an α-contraction on L^p_β endowed with the equivalent norm

$$(Y, Z) \mapsto \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_K \left[\frac{L'}{\sqrt[p]{\alpha}} |Y|^p + \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} |Z|^p \right] e^{\beta A_s} \, \nu(ds, dx).$$

In all cases there exists a unique fixed point which is the required unique solution to the BSDE (3.17). □

Remark 3.6 Under Hypothesis 3.1 we have existence of the solution to the BSDE (3.1), in the sense of Definition 3.1. In contrast, the uniqueness holds in the smaller subclasses L^p_β but it is not guaranteed within the class of all possible solutions as show the following example.
Consider a univariate point process. The space $K = \{\Delta\}$ is a singleton, and $N_t = 1_{\{S\le t\}}$, where S is a variable with values in $(0,T]\cup\{\infty\}$. The filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ is still the one generated by N, and G denotes the law of S, whereas $g(t) = G((t,\infty]$. We suppose that G has no atom, but is supported by $[0,T]$. We have $A_t = a(t\wedge S)$, where $a(t) = -\log g(t)$ is increasing, finite for $t < v$ and infinite if $t \ge v$, where $v = \inf(t : g(t) = 0) \le T$ is the right end point of the support of the measure G.
Consider the following equation with $\xi = 0$ and $f(t,x,y,z) = z$

$$Y_t + \int_{(t,T]} Z_s\,(dN_s - dA_s) = 0, \tag{3.26}$$

$Y_t = 0$ is solution, but $Y_t = we^{A_t}\,1_{\{t<S\}}$ for any $w\in\mathbb{R}$ is also a solution (see [12, Proposition 11]) .

4 An approximation scheme

In this section we show how it is possible to reduce the problem of solving Equation (3.1) to solving a finite system of ordinary differential equation: the solution to the (3.1) can be obtained as limit of a finite sequence of deterministic differential equation.

4.1 An approximation of the BSDE (3.1).

We will approximate the BSDE (3.1) by a other BSDE driven by random measures with a finite number of jumps.
For each (finite) integer $m \ge 1$ let us consider the BSDE

$$\begin{array}{c} Y^m_t + \int_t^T\int_E Z^m(s,x)\,\mu^m(ds,dx) = \xi^m + \int_t^T\int_E f(s,x,Y^m_s,Z^m_s(\cdot))\,1_{s\le S_m}\,\nu^m(ds,dx) \\ \mu^m(ds,dx) = \mu(ds,dx)\,1_{\{s\le S_m\}},\quad \nu^m(ds,dx) = \nu(ds,dx)\,1_{\{s\le S_m\}},\quad \xi^m = \xi\,1_{\{T<S_m\}}. \end{array} \tag{4.1}$$

Then ν^m is the compensator of μ^m, relative to $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ and also to the smaller filtration $(\mathcal{F}^{(m)}_t = \mathcal{F}_{t\wedge S_m})$ generated by μ^m, whereas ξ^m is $\mathcal{F}^{(m)}_T$-measurable.
We note that the generator $f(s,x,y,z)\,1_{s\le S_m}$ and the terminal condition ξ^m satisfy Hypothesis 3.1 with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_{t\wedge S_m})$. By Theorem 3.5 there exists a solution (Y^m, Z^m) in L^p_β for $\beta > 1 + \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} + pL' + (p-1)((L+1)^p(1+\epsilon))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$. We may assume $Y^m_s = \xi^m = 0$, $Z^m_s = 0$ for $S_m < s \le T$, so that the BSDE (4.1) becomes

$$Y^m_t + \int_t^T\int_K Z^m(s,x)\,\mu(ds,dx) = \xi^m + \int_t^T\int_K f(s,x,Y^m_s,Z^m(s,x))\,1_{s\le S_m}\,\nu(ds,dx), \qquad t\in[0,T], \tag{4.2}$$

and we have $\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T\int_K(|Y^m_s|^p + |Z(s,x)^m|^p)\,e^{\beta A_s}\nu(ds,dx)\right] < \infty$. Clearly, Y^m is adapted and Z^m is predictable also with respect to the natural filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ of μ.

Proposition 4.1 *Let (Y^m, Z^m) and and (Y, Z) be the solutions in L^p_β to the BSDEs (4.2) and (3.1) respectively. Then, if $\beta > 1 + \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} + pL' + (p-1)((L+1)^p(1+\epsilon))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$, there exists a constant C independent of m such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\int_K (|Y_s - Y_s^m|^p + |Z(s,x) - Z^m(s,x)|^p)\, e^{\beta A_s}\nu(ds,dx)\\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}\left[|\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} 1_{S_m<T} + \int_{S_m\wedge T}^T\int_K |f(s,x,0,0)|^p e^{\beta A_s}\nu(ds,dx)\right]\end{aligned}$$

Proof.
We define $\bar{Y} = Y - Y^m$, $\bar{Z} = Z - Z^m$, and note that $(\bar{Y}, \bar{Z})$ is the solution to

$$\bar{Y}_t + \int_t^T\int_K \bar{Z}(s,x)\,\mu(ds,dx) = \bar{\xi} + \int_t^T\int_K \bar{f}(s,x,\bar{Y}_s,\bar{Z}(s,x))\,\nu(ds,dx) \qquad t\in[0,T],$$

where we have set $\bar{f}(s,x,y,z) = f(s,x,Y_s^m + y, Z_s^m + z) - f(s,x,Y_s^m, Z_s^m)1_{s\leq S_m}$ and $\bar{\xi} = \xi - \xi^m$. We deduce from the a priori estimate (3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\int_K (|\bar{Y}_s|^p + |\bar{Z}(s,x)|^p)\, e^{\beta A_s}\nu(ds,dx)\\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}\left[|\bar{\xi}|^p e^{\beta A_T} + \int_0^T |\bar{f}(s,x,0,0)|^p e^{\beta A_s}\nu(ds,dx)\right]\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[|\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} 1_{S_m<T} + \int_{S_m\wedge T}^T\int_K |f(s,x,0,0)|^p e^{\beta A_s}\nu(ds,dx)\right]\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because $Y_s^m = 0,\ Z_s^m = 0$ for $S_m < s \leq T$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\int_K (|Y_s - Y_s^m|^p + |Z(s,x) - Z^m(s,x)|^p)\, e^{\beta A_s}\nu(ds,dx)\\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}\left[|\xi|^p e^{\beta A_T} 1_{S_m<T} + \int_{S_m\wedge T}^T\int_K |f(s,x,0,0)|^p e^{\beta A_s}\nu(ds,dx)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

□

Remark 4.2 Since the right-hand side in (4.3) tends to 0 as $m \to \infty$, Proposition 4.1 ensures that it is possible approximate the solution (Y, Z) to the (3.1), with the solution to the BSDE (4.2) driven by random measures with a finite number of jumps. Moreover it furnish the error estimate for this approximation. In the case when ξ and $f(s,x,0,0)$ are uniformly bounded, the approximation error can easily be expressed in terms of $P(S_m < T)$. Under L^p_β integrability conditions in Hypothesis 3.1, a similar result can be obtained using Hölder inequality.

4.2 Reduction to ordinary differential equations.

In this section, we recall how, using a result in [12], it is possible to reduce the problem of solving equation (4.2) to solving a sequence of ordinary differential equations.
Beside $(\mathbf{A_1})$ we need here also the following

Assumption $\mathbf{A_2}$: $\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} > T \mid \mathcal{F}_{S_n}) > 0$ for all $n \geq 0$.

This condition is useful to characterize the $\mathcal{F}_{S_n}$-conditional law of (S_{n+1}, X_{n+1}) and the compensator ν of μ (see [12, Section 4]).

The process (S_n, X_n) takes its values in the set $\mathcal{S} = ([0,T] \times K) \cup \{(\infty, \Delta)\}$. For any integer $n \geq 0$ we let H_n be the subset of $\mathcal{S}^{n+1}$ consisting in all $D = ((t_0, x_0), \cdots, (t_n, x_n))$ satisfying

$$t_0 = 0,\ x_0 = \Delta, \quad t_{j+1} \geq t_j, \quad t_j \leq T \ \Rightarrow\ t_{j+1} > t_j, \quad t_j > T \ \Rightarrow\ (t_j, x_j) = (\infty, \Delta).$$

We set $D^{\max} = t_n$ and endow H_n with its Borel σ-field $\mathcal{H}_n$. We set $S_0 = 0$ and $X_0 = \Delta$, so

$$D_n = ((S_0, X_0), \cdots, (S_n, X_n)) \tag{4.4}$$

is a random element with values in H_n, whose law is denoted as Λ_n (a probability measure on $(H_n, \mathcal{H}_n)$).

The process Y^m solution to (4.2) is an adapted càdlàg process, which further is continuous outside the times S_n. Hence for each $0 \leq n \leq m$ there is a Borel function $y^n = y^n_D(t)$ on $H_n \times [0,T]$ such that

$$\begin{array}{l} D^{\max} = \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad y^n_D(t) = 0 \\ t \mapsto y^n_D(t) \ \text{ is continuous on } [0,T] \text{ and constant on } [0, T \wedge D^{\max}] \\ S_n(\omega) \leq t < S_{n+1}(\omega), \quad t \leq T \ \Rightarrow\ Y_t(\omega) = y^n_{D_n(\omega)}(t), \end{array} \tag{4.5}$$

and we express this as $Y \equiv (y^n)_{n=0}^m$. Also the component Z^m of the solution to (4.2) can be express as $Z^m \equiv (z^n)_{n=0}^m$ where $z^n = z^n_D(t,x)$ is a Borel function on $H_n \times [0,T] \times E$ such that

$$\begin{array}{l} D^{\max} = \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad z^n_D(t,x) = 0 \\ S_n(\omega) < t \leq S_{n+1}(\omega) \wedge T \quad \Rightarrow \quad Z(\omega,t,x) = z^n_{D_n(\omega)}(t,x). \end{array} \tag{4.6}$$

The generator $f\, 1_{s \leq S_m}$ has a nice predictability property only after plugging in a predictable function Z. This implies that, for any $0 \leq n \leq m$, and $z^n = z^n_D(t,x)$, one has a Borel function $f\{z^n\}^n = f\{z^n\}^n_D(t,x,y,w)$ on $H_n \times [0,T] \times E \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, such that (with $t \leq T$ below)

$$\begin{array}{l} D^{\max} = \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad f\{z^n\}^n_D(t,x,y) = 0 \\ S_n(\omega) < t \leq S_{n+1}(\omega),\ \zeta(x) = w + z^n_{D_n(\omega)}(t,x) \ \Rightarrow\ f(\omega,t,x,y,\zeta) = f\{z^n\}^n_{D_n(\omega)}(t,x,y,w). \end{array} \tag{4.7}$$

The variable ξ^m is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable, hence for each $0 \leq n \leq m$ there is an $\mathcal{H}_n$-measurable map $D \mapsto u^n_D$ on H_n with

$$\begin{array}{l} D^{\max} = \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad u^n_D = 0 \\ S_n(\omega) \leq T < S_{n+1}(\omega) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \xi(\omega) = u^n_{D_n(\omega)}. \end{array} \tag{4.8}$$

By [12, Lemma 7] $Y^m \equiv (y^n)_{n=0}^m$ is a solution if and only if for P-almost all ω we have:

$$t \in [0,T] \quad \Rightarrow \quad y^m_{D_m(\omega)}(t) = u^m_{D_m(\omega)} = \xi(\omega). \tag{4.9}$$

and for all $n = 0, \cdots, m-1$

$$y^n_{D_n(\omega)}(t) = u^n_{D_n(\omega)} + \int_t^T \int_E f\{\widehat{y}^{n+1}\}^n_{D_n(\omega)}(s, x, y^n_{D_n(\omega)}(s), -y^n_{D_n(\omega)}(s))\, \nu^n_{D_n(\omega)}(ds,dx),\ t \in [0,T]. \tag{4.10}$$

where we set

$$\widehat{y}^{n+1} = (\widehat{y}^{n+1}_D(t,x) :\ (D,t,x) \in H_n \times [0,T] \times E) : \quad \widehat{y}^{n+1}_D(t,x) = y^{n+1}_{D \cup \{(t,x)\}}(t)\, 1_{\{t > D^{max}\}}. \tag{4.11}$$

As stressed before, we need to assume $(\mathbf{A_1})$, as in previous sections, and also $(\mathbf{A_2})$. The following Lemma provides a condition which implies Assumption $(\mathbf{A_2})$.

Lemma 4.3 *Assume* $(\mathbf{A_1})$. *Then, for* $n \geq 0$ *the inequality* $\mathbb{E}[e^{A_{T\wedge S_{n+1}}}] < \infty$ *implies*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} > T \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{S_n}) > 0 \quad a.s. \tag{4.12}$$

In particular, if

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\beta A_T}] < \infty, \tag{4.13}$$

then (4.12) *holds true for every* $n \geq 0$.

Proof. Let $G'^n_{D_n}(dt)$ be the conditional law of S_{n+1} given $\mathcal{F}_{S_n}$. Let us introduce the corresponding cumulative distribution function $F_D(t) = G'^n_D((0,t])$. Since we assume that the dual predictable projection A of μ is continuous we can take a version of F_D which is continuous in t and we have, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned} A_t &= A_{S_n} + \int_{S_n}^t \frac{1}{1 - F_{D_n}(s)}\, F_{D_n}(ds) = \\ &= A_{S_n} - \log(1 - F_{D_n}(t)), \qquad S_n < t \leq S_{n+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Since F_D is continuous in t, the conditional law of $F_{D_n}(S_{n+1})$ given $\mathcal{F}_{S_n}$ is the uniform distribution on $(0,1)$, so that in particular $\mathbb{E}[(1-F_{D_n}(S_{n+1}))^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_{S_n}] = \infty$ a.s. Now suppose that (4.12) is violated for some n. Then there exists $Q \in \mathcal{F}_{S_n}$ with $\mathbb{P}(Q) > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} \leq T \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{S_n}) = 1$ on Q. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(Q) = \mathbb{E}[1_Q\, \mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} \leq T \,|\, \mathcal{F}_{S_n})] = \mathbb{P}(Q \cap \{S_{n+1} \leq T\}),$$

which shows that $S_{n+1} \leq T$ a.s. on Q. It follows from (4.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[e^{A_{T\wedge S_{n+1}}}] \geq \mathbb{E}[1_Q\, e^{A_{T\wedge S_{n+1}}}] \geq \mathbb{E}[1_Q\, e^{A_{S_{n+1}}}] \geq \\ &\mathbb{E}[1_Q\, (1 - F_{D_n}(S_{n+1}))^{-1}] = \mathbb{E}[1_Q\, \mathbb{E}[(1 - F_{D_n}(S_{n+1}))^{-1}|\mathcal{F}_{S_n}]] = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the assumption. The first part of the lemma is therefore proved.

Next assume the (4.13). Then, the conclusion follows from the statement proved above noting that

$$\infty > \mathbb{E}[e^{\beta A_T}] \geq \mathbb{E}[e^{\beta A_{T\wedge S_n}}].$$

□

5 Optimal control

In this section we use the previous results on the BSDE to solve an optimal control problem. We assume that a marked point process μ of (2.1) is given on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, generating the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ and satisfying $\mathbf{A_1}$. In particular we suppose that $T_n \to \infty$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

The data specifying the optimal control problem are an action (or decision) space U, and a function r specifying the effect of the control process, a running cost function l, a terminal cost function g. We assume that these data satisfy the following conditions.

Hypothesis 5.1 *1.* $(U,\mathcal{U})$ *is a measurable space.*

2. The functions $r, l : \Omega \times [0,T] \times K \times U \to \mathbb{R}$ *are predictable and there exist constants* $C_r > 1$, $C_l > 0$ *such that*

$$0 \leq r(\omega,t,x,u) \leq C_r, \quad |l(\omega,t,x,u)| \leq C_l, \qquad \omega \in \Omega, t \in [0,T], x \in K, u \in U. \tag{5.1}$$

3. The function $g : \Omega \times K \to \mathbb{R}$ *is* $\mathcal{F}_T \otimes \mathcal{K}$*-measurable.*

We define as an admissible control process any predictable process $(u_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ with values in U. The set of admissible control processes is denoted $\mathcal{A}$.

To every control $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$ we associate a probability measure $\mathbb{P}_u$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ by a change of measure of Girsanov type, as we now describe. We define

$$L_t = \exp\left(\int_0^t \int_K (1 - r(s, x, u_s))\, \nu(ds, dx)\right) \prod_{n\geq 1\,:\, S_n \leq t} r(S_n, X_n, u_{S_n}), \qquad t \in [0, T],$$

with the convention that the last product equals 1 if there are no indices $n \geq 1$ satisfying $S_n \leq t$. L is a nonnegative supermartingale, (see [17] Proposition 4.3). Moreover the following result holds

Lemma 5.2 *([10, Lemma 4.2]) Let $\gamma > 1$ and*

$$\beta = \gamma + 1 + \frac{C_r^{q^2}}{q-1}. \tag{5.2}$$

If $\mathbb{E}\exp(\beta A_T) < \infty$ then we have $\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \mathbb{E}L_t^\gamma < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}L_T = 1$.

Under the assumption of the lemma, the process L is a martingale. By Girsanov's Theorem for point processes, the predictable compensator of the measure μ under $\mathbb{P}_u$ is

$$\nu^u(dt, dx) = r(t, x, u_t)\, \nu(dt,\, dx) = r(t, x, u_t)\, \phi_t(dx)\, dA_t.$$

We finally define the cost associated to every $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$ as

$$J(u(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}_u\Big(\int_0^T l(t, X_t, u_t)\, dA_t + g(X_T)\Big),$$

where $\mathbb{E}_u$ denotes the expectation under $\mathbb{P}_u$. Later we will assume that

$$\mathbb{E}[|g(X_T)|^p e^{\beta A_T}] < \infty \tag{5.3}$$

for some $\beta > 0$ that will be fixed in such a way that the cost is finite for every admissible control. The control problem consists in minimizing $J(u(\cdot))$ over $\mathcal{A}$. A basic role is played by the BSDE

$$Y_t + \int_t^T \int_K Z(s, x)\, \mu(ds, dx) = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, X_s, Z_s(\cdot))\, dA_s, \tag{5.4}$$

with terminal condition $g(X_T)$ being the terminal cost above, and with the generator f being the Hamiltonian function defined below. This is Equation (3.1), with f only depending on (ω, t, ζ), and indeed it comes from an equation of type II via the transformation (3.10).

The Hamiltonian function f is defined on $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathcal{B}(E)$ as

$$f(\omega, t, x, z(\cdot)) = \begin{cases} \inf_{u\in U} \left(l(\omega, t, x, u) + \int_K z(x)\, r(\omega, t, x, u)\, \phi_{\omega,t}(dx)\right) & \text{if } \int_K |\zeta(x)|\, \phi_{\omega,t}(dx) < \infty \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

We will assume that the infimum is in fact achieved, possibly at many points. Moreover we need to verify that the generator of the BSDE satisfies the conditions required in Hypothesis 3.1, in particular the measurability property which does not follow from its definition. An appropriate assumption is the following one, since we will see below in Proposition 5.5 that it can be verified under quite general conditions.

Hypothesis 5.3 *For every predictable function Z on $\Omega \times [0,T] \times E$ there exists a U-valued predictable process (i.e., an admissible control) $\underline{u}^Z$ such that, $dA_t(\omega)\mathbb{P}(d\omega)$-almost surely,*

$$f(\omega,t,X_{t-}(\omega),Z_{\omega,t}(\cdot)) = l(t,X_{t-}(\omega),\underline{u}^Z(\omega,t)) + \int_K Z_{\omega,t}(x)\left(r(\omega,t,x,\underline{u}^Z(\omega,t))\right)\phi_{\omega,t}(dx) \quad (5.6)$$

We can now verify that all the assumptions of Hypothesis 3.1 hold true for the generator of the BSDE (5.4). The (5.6) shows that the process $(\omega,t) \mapsto f(\omega,t,X_{t-}(\omega),Z_t(\omega,\cdot))$ is progressive; since A is assumed to have continuous trajectories and X has piecewise constant paths, the progressive set $\{(\omega,t) : X_{t-}(\omega) \neq X_t(\omega)\}$ has measure zero with respect to $dA_t(\omega)\mathbb{P}(d\omega)$; it follows that the process

$$(\omega,t) \mapsto f(\omega,t,X_t(\omega),Z_t(\omega,\cdot))$$

is progressive, after modification on a set of measure zero, as required in (3.4). Using the boundedness assumptions (5.1), it is easy to check that (3.5) is verified with $L' = 0$ and $L = C_r$. Using (5.1) again we also have

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T e^{\beta A_t}|f(t,X_t,0)|^p dA_t = \mathbb{E}\int_0^T e^{\beta A_t}|\inf_{u\in U} l(\omega,t,X_t,u)|^p dA_t \leq C_l^p\,\beta^{-1}\,\mathbb{E}\,e^{\beta A_T}, \quad (5.7)$$

so that (3.6) holds as well provided the right-hand side of (5.7) is finite. Assuming finally that (5.3) holds, by Theorem 3.5 the BSDE has a unique solution $(Y,Z) \in L^p_\beta$ if $\beta > 1 + \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} + (p-1)(2L^p(1+\epsilon))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$.

The corresponding admissible control $\underline{u}^Z$, whose existence is required in Assumption (C), will be denoted as u^*.

Theorem 5.4 *Assume that Hypotheses 5.1 and 5.3 are satisfied and that .*

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\left[\left(\frac{2p-1}{p-1} + (p-1)C_r^{\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^2}\right)A_T\right] < \infty. \quad (5.8)$$

Suppose also that there exists β such that

$$\beta > 1 + \frac{c_\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} + (p-1)((C_r+1)^p(1+\epsilon))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}, \quad \mathbb{E}\exp(\beta A_T) < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E}[|g(X_T)|^p e^{\beta A_T}] < \infty. \quad (5.9)$$

Let $(Y,Z) \in L^p_\beta$ denote the solution to the BSDE (5.4) and $u^* = \underline{u}^Z$ the corresponding admissible control. Then $u^*(\cdot)$ is optimal and $Y_0 = J(u^*(\cdot)) = \inf_{u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}} J(u(\cdot))$ is the optimal cost.

Proof. Fix $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}$. Assumption (5.8) allows to apply Lemma 5.2 with $\gamma = \frac{p}{p-1}$ and yields $\mathbb{E}L_T^{\frac{p}{p-1}} < \infty$. It follows that $g(X_T)$ is integrable under $\mathbb{P}_u$. Indeed by (5.3)

$$\mathbb{E}_u|g(X_T)| = \mathbb{E}|L_T g(X_T)| \leq (\mathbb{E}L_T^{\frac{p}{p-1}})^{\frac{p-1}{p}}(\mathbb{E}g(X_T)^p)^{1/p} < \infty.$$

We next show that under $\mathbb{P}_u$ we have $\mathbb{E}_u\int_0^T\int_K |Z(t,x)|\,\nu^u(dt\,dx) < \infty$. First note that, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T\int_K |Z(t,x)|\,\nu(dt,dx) &= \int_0^T\int_K e^{-\frac{\beta}{p}A_t}e^{\frac{\beta}{p}A_t}|Z(t,x)|\,\nu(dt,dx) \\
&\leq \left(\int_0^T e^{-\frac{1}{p-1}\beta A_t}dA_t\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\left(\int_0^T\int_K e^{\beta A_t}|Z(t,x)|^p\,\nu(dt,dx)\right)^{1/p} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{p-1}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\left(\int_0^T\int_K e^{\beta A_t}|Z(t,x)|^p\,\nu(dt,dx)\right)^{1/p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using (5.1),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_u \int_0^T \int_K |Z(t,x)|\, \nu^u(dt,dx) &= \mathbb{E}_u \int_0^T \int_K |Z(t,x)|\, r(t,x,u_t)\, \nu(dt,dx) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[L_T \int_0^T \int_K |Z(t,x)|\, r(t,x,u_t)\, \nu(dt,dx) \right] \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E} L_T^{\frac{p}{p-1}})^{\frac{p-1}{p}} C_r \left(\frac{p-1}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_K e^{\beta A_t} |Z(t,x)|^p\, \nu(dt,dx) \right)^{1/p}\end{aligned}$$

and the right-hand side of the last inequality is finite, since $(Y,Z) \in L^p_\beta$.

By similar arguments we also check that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_u \textstyle\int_0^T |f(t,Z_t(\cdot))|\, dA_t &= \mathbb{E} L_T \textstyle\int_0^T |f(t,X_t,Z_t(\cdot))|\, dA_t \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} L_T\, C_r \Big(\textstyle\int_0^T \Big[\big(\int_K |Z(t,x)|^p\, \phi_{\omega,t}(dx) \big)^{1/p} + |f(t,X_t,0)| \Big]\, dA_t \Big) < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Setting $t=0$ and taking the $\mathbb{P}_u$-expectation in the BSDE (5.4) we therefore obtain

$$Y_0 + \mathbb{E}_u \Big(\int_0^T \int_K Z(t,x)\, r(t,x,u_t)\, \nu(dt,dx) \Big) = \mathbb{E}_u(g(X_T)) + \mathbb{E}_u \Big(\int_0^T f(t,Z_t(\cdot))\, dA_t \Big).$$

Adding $\mathbb{E}_u\big(\int_0^T l(t,X_t,u_t)\, dA_t \big)$ to both sides, we finally obtain the equality

$$\begin{aligned}&Y_0 + \mathbb{E}_u \Big(\textstyle\int_0^T \big(l(t,X_t,u_t) + \int_K Z(t,x)\, r(t,x,u_t)\, \phi_t(dx) \big)\, dA_t \Big) \\ &\quad = J(u(\cdot)) + \mathbb{E}_u \Big(\textstyle\int_0^T f(t,Z_t(\cdot))\, dA_t \Big) \\ &\quad = J(u(\cdot)) + \mathbb{E}_u \Big(\textstyle\int_0^T \inf_{u\in U} \big(l(t,X_t,u) + \int_K Z(t,x)\, r(t,x,u_t), \phi_t(dx) \big)\, dA_t \Big).\end{aligned}$$

This implies immediately the inequality $Y_0 \leq J(u(\cdot))$ for every admissible control, with an equality if $u(\cdot) = u^*(\cdot)$. □

Assumption (C) can be verified in specific situations when it is possible to compute explicitly the function $\underline{u}^Z$. General conditions for its validity can also be formulated using appropriate measurable selection theorems, as in the following proposition. Its proof can be found in [12], Proposition 17.

Proposition 5.5 *Suppose that U is a compact metric space with its Borel σ-field $\mathcal{U}$ and that the functions $r(\omega,t,x,\cdot), l(\omega,t,\cdot)$ are continuous on U for every (ω,t,x). Then if further r satisfies* (5.1)*, Assumption (C) holds.*

Acknowledgments. We wish to thank Prof. Jean Jacod for discussions on connections between BSDEs and point processes.

References

[1] Aubin, J.-P. and H. Frankowska (1990). *Set-valued analysis*. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications, 2. Birkhäuser.

[2] Bandini, E., Confortola F. Optimal control of semi-Markov processes with a backward stochastic differential equations approach. Preprint, arXiv: 1311.1063.

[3] Barles, G., R. Buckdahn and E. Pardoux (1997). Backward stochastic differential equations and integral-partial differential equations. *Stochastics and Stochastics Reports*, **60**, 57-83.

[4] Becherer, D. (2006). Bounded Solutions to Backward SDE's with Jumps for Utility Optimization and Indifference Hedging. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, **16**, 2027-2054.

[5] Buckdahn, R. and E. Pardoux (1994). BSDE's with jumps and associated integral-stochastic differential equations. Preprint.

[6] Carbone, R., B. Ferrario and M. Santacroce (2008) Backward stochastic differential equations driven by cdlg martingales. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **52**, 304-314.

[7] Cohen S.N. and R.J. Elliott (2008) Solutions of backward stochastic differential equations on Markov chains, *Commun. Stoch. Anal.*, **2**, 251-262.

[8] Cohen S.N. and R.J. Elliott (2010) Comparisons for backward stochastic differential equations on Markov chains and related no-arbitrage conditions, *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, **20**, 267-311.

[9] Cohen S.N. and L. Szpruch (2012) On Markovian solution to Markov Chain BSDEs. *Numerical Algebra, Control Optim.*, **2**, 257-269.

[10] Confortola F., Fuhrman M. Backward stochastic differential equations and optimal control of marked point processes. SIAM J. Control Optimization 51(5) (2013), 3592-3623.

[11] Confortola F., Fuhrman M. Backward stochastic differential equations associated to jump Markov processes and their applications. Stochastic Processes and their Applications 124 (2014), 289-316.

[12] Confortola F., Fuhrman M., Jacod J. Backward stochastic differential equation driven by a marked point process: an elementary approach with an application to optimal control, Annals of Applied Probability, to appear.

[13] Crépey, S. and A. Matoussi (2008). Reflected and doubly reflected BSDEs with jumps: a priori estimates and comparison. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, **18**, 2041-2069.

[14] Davis, M.H.A. The representation of martingales of jump processes. SIAM J. Control Optimization 14 (1976), no. 4, 623-638.

[15] Davis, M.H.A. Markov models and optimization. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability, 49. Chapman & Hall, 1993.

[16] El Karoui, N., S. Peng and M.-C. Quenez (1997). Backward Stochastic Differential Equations in finance. *Mathematical Finance*, **7**, 1-71.

[17] Jacod, J. (1974). Multivariate point processes: predictable projection, Radon-Nikodym derivatives, representation of martingales. *Zeit. für Wahr.*, **31**, 235-253.

[18] Jacod, J. and Mémin, J. (1981). Weak and strong solutions of stochastic differential equations: existence and stability. In *Stochastic Integrals*, R. Williams ed., Springer Verlag, Lectures Notes in Math. **851**, 169-212 (1981).

[19] Kharroubi, I. and Lim, T. (2012). Progressive enlargement of Filtrations and Backward SDEs with jumps. Preprint.

[20] Pardoux, E. and S. Peng (1990). Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Syst. Control Lett.*, **14**, 55-61.

[21] Shen, L. and R.J. Elliott (2011). Backward Stochastic Differential Equations for a Single Jump Process. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*, **29**, 654-673.

[22] Tang, S.J. and X.J. Li (1994) Necessary conditions for optimal control of stochastic systems with random jumps. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, **32**, 1447-1475.

[23] Xia, J. (200) Backward stochastic differential equation with random measures. *Acta Math. Appl. Sinica (English Ser.)*, **16**, No 3, 225-234.